



# EPA Puget Sound Financial and Ecosystem Accounting Tracking System (FEATS)

Photo by Rebecca Pirtle, Editor, Kingston Community News (Doe-Kag-Wats Estuary of the Suquamish Tribe)

## PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>1. Federal Grant Number</b>	PA-00J322-01	<b>*2a. Reporting Period Start Date:</b>	10/1/2013	<b>*2b. Reporting Period End Date:</b>	3/31/2014
<b>3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including zip code)</b> Name: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commissi Address 1: 6730 Martin Way East Address 2: City: Olympia State: WA Zip Code: 98516-5540			<b>4. Project Manager Contact Information</b> Name: Terry Wright Phone: (360) 528-4336 Ext: Fax: ( ) - Email: wright@nwifc.org		
<b>5a. Program (RFP)</b>  <b>Tribal Lead Org</b>	<b>5b. Project Title</b>  Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Lead Organization Award		<b>*6. Collaborating Organizations/Partners</b>  None  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Subawardee</b> 21 Tribes/Tribal Consortiums		

<b>Submission Instructions:</b> EPA fills in the white boxes. Grantee fills in the yellow boxes (boxes with asterisks). Refer to guidance document for how to fill out the boxes.  After completing the form, save and e-mail it to the Project Officer and cc: the Technical Monitor.	<b>Project Officer:</b> Lisa Chang <b>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</b> <b>Email:</b> chang.lisa@epa.gov  <b>Technical Monitor:</b> <b>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</b> <b>Email:</b>	<b>*7a. Name/Title of Person Submitting Report</b>	Tiffany Waters PS Recovery Proj. Coordinator
		<b>*7b. Date Report Submitted</b>	4/29/2014

## FUNDING/COST ANALYSIS

8a. Total EPA Assistance Amount Awarded:	\$15,700,581.00	8b. Funding Year (Federal Fiscal Year Funds Appropriated)	FY 2010 FY 2011 FY 2012 FY 2013	*9. Total EPA Amount Expended To-Date:	\$7,873,752.19	*10. Funds Drawn Down from EPA To-Date:	\$7,710,080.00
11. Match Amount Required	\$0.00	*12. Total Match Amount Expended and Documented To-Date:	\$0.00	*13. Have you experienced any cost overruns or high unit costs?	No		
*14. What issues or questions do you need the EPA Project Officer or Technical Monitor to respond to?		None					

## BUDGET UPDATE

	15a. APPROVED BUDGET			*15b. SPENT TO-DATE		
	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL
Personnel	\$160,035.67	\$0.00	\$160,035.67	\$165,870.39	\$0.00	\$165,870.39
Fringe Benefits	\$50,535.60	\$0.00	\$50,535.60	\$52,932.23	\$0.00	\$52,932.23
Travel	\$6,316.00	\$0.00	\$6,316.00	\$8,127.69	\$0.00	\$8,127.69
Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ 0.00		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Supplies	\$4,968.14	\$0.00	\$4,968.14	\$4,461.82	\$0.00	\$4,461.82
Contracts	\$37,500.00	\$0.00	\$37,500.00		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Other	\$11,706,362.06	\$0.00	\$11,706,362.06	\$7,540,363.14	\$0.00	\$7,540,363.14
TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES	\$11,964,517.47	\$0.00	\$11,964,517.47		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Indirect Charges	\$115,481.99	\$0.00	\$115,481.99	\$101,996.92	\$0.00	\$101,996.92
TOTAL	\$12,079,999.46	\$0.00	\$12,079,999.46	\$7,873,752.19	\$0.00	\$7,873,752.19
*Explain Any Discrepancies:	The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission operates on a reimbursement basis with our member tribes.					

## ECOSYSTEM GOALS ADDRESSED

16a. Primary Goal	Healthy Habitat
16b. Additional Goals	Healthy Species    Water Quality    Water Quantity    -----    -----    -----

## DIRECT THREATS ADDRESSED

17a. Primary Threat	-----
17b. Secondary Threat(s)	Climate Change    Dams/Levees/Tidegates    Derelict Gear/Vessels    Development    Invasive Species - Terrestrial Invasive Species - Marine
	Large Scale Timber Harvest    Shoreline Armoring    Surface Water Loading/Runoff from the Built Env    -----

## LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA

18a. Strategic Priorities Employed	Priority A    Priority B    Priority C    Priority D    Priority E
18b. Near-Term Actions Supported	D.3 NTA 3
18c. Other Actions Supported	

## LINKAGES TO EPA PUGET SOUND MEASURES

19. Measure(s)	Habitat Restored/Protected    -----    -----
----------------	--

## LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND DASHBOARD INDICATORS

20a. Primary Indicator	-----
20b. Additional Indicators	Marine Water Quality Index    Stream Flows Below Critical Levels    Wild Chinook Salmon    Pacific Herring Shoreline Armoring

## PROJECT LOCATION

21a. Latitude	47.051698	21b. Longitude	-122.792501
21c. Hydrologic Unit Code	171100 - Sound-wide	-----	-----
21d. Action Area	Sound-wide	-----	-----

## MEASURES OF SUCCESS (Key Grant Outputs)

*22a. Description (e.g., "shellfish beds reopened")	*22b. Unit (e.g., "acres")	*22c. Project Target ("number")	*22d. Project Measure To-Date ("number")
Developed and distributed a final RFP to 21 Tribes and Tribal Consortiums for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	RFP Document	6	4
Developed and engaged in a Coordination Plan, disseminating and sharing a subrecipient project information document each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15) with tribes and LO group	Subrecipient Proposal Information	6	4
Approved 21 subrecipient proposals, communicated award notification and executed contracts to all subrecipients for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	Subrecipient Contracts in Place	126	75
Closed-out 21 subrecipient workplans with deliverables received and posted online to PSP/NWIFC website for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	Subrecipient Contracts Closed-out	126	18

## PROJECT MILESTONES

**Instructions:** In the tables below, please explain your progress toward meeting agreed outputs for the period, **reasons for slippages**, and any additional information including **reflections, lessons learned, and/or thoughtful analysis**. When appropriate, include analysis and information of **cost overruns or high unit costs**, and changes to work plan or budget not requiring prior approval from EPA. We encourage photo documentation - please attach to the report as a separate document.

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:** 1. Program development and launch

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:** D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**

**Actual Costs to Date:**

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
1.1	Communication/outreach plan	1.14.11, 7.12.11, 6.22.12, 6.17.13	COMPLETED	Communication/outreach plan	NWIFC developed a communication/outreach plan for FY10 and FY11 that consisted of: (1) a transmittal note for the RFP; (2) a mailing distribution list that

					<p>ensured that all eligible entities were notified equitably, timely, and thoroughly; and (3) a target date for releasing the RFP.</p> <p>Due to our previous interactions and current relationships with our member tribes, we had in place a Puget Sound Tribes distribution list that contained pertinent tribal contacts. We vetted this distribution list to ensure that the proper contacts are included and have continued to add to this distribution list as needed and requested.</p>
1.2	RFP development and distribution	1.25.11, 7.15.11, 6.22.12, 8.5.13	COMPLETED	Final RFP distributed	<p>NWIFC developed the final FY10 RFP through close consultation with the EPA, utilizing and editing the FY08 RFP to finalize the FY10's fundamental components and timeline. Additions to the FY10 RFP included: (1) language that fully described the intent of these funds; (2) requirements for all projects that collect environmental data to have a QAPP in place prior to data collection; and (3) logic model terminology. While we didn't include the traditional logic model table format, we utilized the logic model terminology to request specific outputs and outcomes per task.</p> <p>The FY10 RFP was then used as a template to develop subsequent fiscal year RFPs.</p> <p>Additions to the FY11 RFP included: (1) adding PSP Ecosystem Recovery Targets as eligible activities under this award; (2) a request to describe</p>

				<p>how the potential impacts of climate change will be addressed in the planning and implementation of the subrecipient project; and (3) additional guidance regarding the information needed in the budget narrative, including a task delineated budget appendix. In consultation with the EPA Project Officer, we finalized the proposal review process and timeline.</p> <p>Additions to the FY12 RFP of note included: (1) clarifying language that delineated differences between subcontracts and professional services within the budget narrative section; and (2) adding a category within the narrative section that required an explanation of how technical review was going to occur for major technical products of the subrecipient workplan. This provision on technical review was included to reflect and satisfy a new term and condition of NWIFC's contract that NWIFC and the EPA project officer collaboratively discussed and agreed upon.</p> <p>Additions to the FY13 RFP of note included: (1) notification and inclusion of a new riparian buffer on agricultural lands term and condition; and (2) a request for distinction between outputs that are tracked to monitor the progress of an award versus deliverables that are work products that will be provided to NWIFC before the close of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					award.  We distributed the final RFP for FY10 on 1.25.11, for FY11 on 7.15.11, for FY12 on 6.22.12, and for FY13 on 8.5.13.
1.3	Coordination plan	1.31.11	COMPLETED	Coordination plan	NWIFC developed a coordination plan that can be executed throughout the project period and includes: (1) ensuring that the PSP is aware of the aims and activities of the subrecipient projects by enlisting them as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) engaging the EPA Project Officer to discuss the capacity awards that the subrecipient projects are concurrently receiving, in order to avoid duplicative funding efforts; (3) engaging in existing processes and groups to disseminate and share subrecipient project information, including the ECB, the Leadership Council, the PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and the PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus; (4) participating in LO meetings to ensure that other LOs are fully award of our subrecipient projects and vise versa; (5) an existing NWIFC website that is dedicated to information related to Puget Sound Partnership and Treaty Tribes of Western Washington.
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:** 2. Award cycle

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:** D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**

**Actual Costs to Date:**

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
2.1	Reviewing subaward proposals	7.6.11, 3.21.11, 1.9.14, ongoing	CURRENT	Project files set up; comments from all reviewers documented; input shared with applicants	<p>All project files have been set up, with all digital files held by the Projects Coordinator and all final hard copies held by the Contracts Specialist.</p> <p>For FY10, FY11, and FY12, NIWFC has received, documented, and shared input from the NWIFC, EPA, and PSP review teams with all 21 subrecipients. For FY12, there is one tribal proposal was withdrawn (due to a change in the Tribe's internal top priorities) and a new proposal was submitted on 11.7.13. This proposal was reviewed, sent for PSP and EPA review, and a packaged review was provided to the Tribe on 1.9.14. A revised proposal addressing review comments was submitted in early April.</p> <p>For FY13, NWIFC received and documented proposals from all 21 subreipients for the 9.23.13 FY13 proposal deadline. All subrecipient proposals are in various stages of internal and external review. There are currently: 2 proposals that NWIFC is still working on with tribes to address preliminary comments before sending off for broader review; 3 proposals that have received a packaged review and</p>

					are being revised by tribes; 1 proposal that NWIFC is reviewing to determine whether reviewer comments have been addressed; 2 proposals that have addressed reviewer comments and have been routed for a final budgetary review and contracting; and 13 proposals that have been contracted.
2.2	Receive final proposals and make subawards	8.2.11, 7.12.12, 4.15.14, ongoing	CURRENT	Final workplans addressing key input received; 65% of funds awarded by 11/16/12; 100% by 1/1/13; all recipients informed of award requirements	<p>For FY10 and FY11, NWIFC has successfully communicated with all 21 subrecipients to address key input and all final workplans have been received, approved, and awarded. For FY12, NWIFC has successfully communicated with 20 subrecipients to address key input and final workplans for these subrecipients have been received, approved, and awarded. As discussed in Task 2.1, there is one subrecipient workplan that was not approved within this reporting period (contracting occurred in April). For FY13, NWIFC has successfully communicated with 13 subrecipients to address key input and final workplans for these subrecipients have been received, approved, and awarded.</p> <p>For FY10, 65% of funds were awarded by 5/19/2011 and 100% of funds were awarded by 8.2.11. For FY11, 65% of funds were awarded by 2.9.12 and 100% of funds were awarded by 7/12/12. For FY12, 65% of funds were awarded by 3.26.13 and 95% of funds were awarded by 9.25.13. For FY13, 62% of funds were awarded by 3/6/2014 and it is anticipated that 100% of funds will</p>

					be awarded by the next reporting deadline.  All contracted subrecipients have been informed of award requirements, as included in their NWIFC contract (including EPA Administrative and Programmatic Conditions; Anti-lobbying Certification; MBE/WBE Certification; Federal Financial Report; EPA FEATS; OMB Circulars A-87, A-133 & A-102; 15 CFR Part 24 & Part 28; 2 CFR Part 1326, Subpart C; and 40 CFR Part 34).
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

<b>23a. Work Plan Component/Task:</b> 3. Program management					
<b>23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:</b> D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.					
<b>*23c. Estimated Costs:</b> <b>Actual Costs to Date:</b> <b>(If required by PO)</b>					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
3.1	Support/meet with awardees	Ongoing	CURRENT	All subrecipients understand applicable award requirements	All subrecipients have been contacted via phone, email, or in person and the appropriate support has continued to be given in regards to the award process and applicable award requirements. The Projects Coordinator retains and files all email correspondence and maintains a phone log tracking

					all substantive phone conversations.
3.2	Conduct project monitoring	Ongoing	CURRENT	Subawardee reporting requirements met; site visits conducted to 33% of funded projects (year 1); site visit and progress reports prepared and made available; all recipients in compliance with applicable award requirements	<p>For the reporting periods of 4.1.11 - 9.30.11, 10.1.11 - 3.31.12, 4.1.12 - 9.30.12, 10.1.12 - 3.31.13, and 4.1.13 - 9.30.13, FY10, FY11 and applicable FY12 subreipients submitted FEATS progress reports to the Projects Coordinator. The Projects Coordinator reviews FEATS for progress to ensure that all subrecipients are in compliance with applicable award requirements, including but not limited to: proper budget invoicing, project timeline adherence, task and output progress (including project requirements such as QAPP and permit approval), draw-down rate versus expenditures. For any FY11 or FY12 projects that were not yet contracted or had not yet begun (neither tasks nor funding begun/expended), the Projects Coordinator communicated with the subreipient that a FEATS was not needed and marked within the tracking sheet which projects had not yet begun.</p> <p>When necessary, the Projects Coordinator communicated with subrecipients to clarify information provided in the FEATS report and ascertain additional project progress. All approved subrecipient FEATS were sent to the Contracts Specialist for final review and approval and were posted online to the PSP/NWIFC website.</p> <p>In anticipation of the next</p>

				<p>subrecipient reporting due on 4.30.14, the Projects Coordinator edited applicable FY10, FY11, and FY12 FEATS to reflect budget modifications and contract amendments and pre-populated applicable FY13 FEATS. The Projects Coordinator emailed each subrecipient project coordinator their FEATS report at the beginning of April, providing a reminder and pre-populated FEATS approximately 30 days prior to their report deadline. Upon receiving FEATS reports on 4.30.14, NWIFC will engage in review and approval of all applicable FY10, FY11, FY12 and FY13 subrecipient FEATS reports.</p> <p>Seven sites visits (Makah Nation, Samish Indian Nation, Nisqually Indian Tribe, Suquamish Tribe, Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, Swinomish Indian Tribe, and Nooksack Indian Tribe) were conducted for the time period of 2011 - 2012 and three site visits (Tulalip Tribes, Squaxin Island Tribe, and Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe) have occurred for the time period of 2012 - 2013. The Projects Coordinator is currently behind schedule in conducting site visits, but plans to conduct an additional four site visits in the spring of 2014; with more site visits to occur in summer and fall of 2014.</p> <p>Site visits are determined using a risk evaluation matrix and conducted to assess project progress and compliance with award requirements (including,</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>but not limited to - adherence to workplan timeline; progress and completion of tasks and outputs; QAPP development, review, and/or approval status; desire/need for an EPA TSR; obstacles or problems encountered by subrecipient; progress report requirement adherence; review of funds spent and/or high award balances, if applicable; and subrecipient questions regarding award conditions, including proposal, review, and reporting requirements).</p> <p>All site visit reports are held at NWIFC and are available upon request.</p>
3.3	Execute coordination plan	4.1.11, 1.10.12, 1.17.13, 3.31.14	CURRENT	<p>Exchange of project lists between LOs; Update of the PSP/NWIFC website to include subaward project descriptions and progress reports, as they become available; Other coordination activities to be developed in consultation with EPA PO</p>	<p>NWIFC continued to: (1) engage the PSP as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) meet with the EPA Project Officer to discuss relevant capacity awards of the subrecipients to ensure funding duplication did not occur; (3) participate in ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings, as possible given the departure of the Puget Sound Policy Analyst; (4) participate in scheduled LO meetings and disseminate a list of subrecipient projects for FY10, FY11, FY12, and FY13 (list provided at the LO Listening Session meeting held on 3/31/14); and (5) update the PSP/NWIFC website to include meeting notes for ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings.</p>

3.4	Reporting and adaptive management	11.30.11, 4.20.12, 10.31.12, 4.30.13, 10.31.13, 4.23.14	CURRENT	LO reporting requirements fulfilled; quarterly check-in meetings/calls with EPA PO	<p>Administration of the program, including periodic progress review, has been coordinated by the Projects Coordinator, under the tutelage of the Salmon Recovery Projects Coordinator. NWIFC continues to be in close contact with NWIFC's EPA Project Officer, engaging in regular check-ins to clarify EPA proposal reviews and discuss challenges faced within the review process. The EPA Projects Officer continues to be extremely helpful, proactive, and communicative during the entirety of this award process.</p> <p>The LO reporting requirements were successfully met for the reporting periods of 4.1.11 - 9.30.11, 10.1.11 - 3.31.12, 4.1.12 - 9.30.12, 10.1.12 - 3.31.13, and 4.1.13 - 9.30.13. The LO reporting requirements are in the process of being fulfilled for the 10.1.13 - 3.31.14 reporting period (as being submitted through this FEATS report).</p>
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:**

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:**

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**

**Actual Costs to Date:**

**(If required by PO)**

23d. Sub-	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h.	*23i. Remarks
-----------	---------------------------	------------	--------------	------	---------------

Task No.				Outputs/Deliverables	
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:**

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:**

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**

**Actual Costs to Date:**

**(If required by PO)**

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

## CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS (specific to reporting period)

*24a. Task No., Sub-Task No.	*24b. Challenge	*24c. Solution
Task 3.2 (Conduct Project Monitoring)	The Projects Coordinator is currently behind in conducting site visits.	Site visits are currently being planned and will be implemented in spring of 2014; and site visit planning will be a priority for the coming summer and fall.


## HIGHLIGHTS/LESSONS LEARNED/REFLECTIONS

**\*25.**

(1) HIGHLIGHT: While all 21 subrecipient proposals contain projects that will and are substantially contributing to the restoration and protection of Puget Sound, we have chosen to highlight the final progress of the following subrecipient projects. Additional tribal project accomplishments are in the process of being reported to NWIFC for this reporting period. Once NWIFC has reviewed and approved the next subrecipient FEATS reports, due to NWIFC on 4/30/14, they will be posted online to the PSP/NWIFC website (<http://blogs.nwifc.org/psp/>).

Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (FY10) - The Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe completed a submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) survey in Sequim Bay to gather baseline data to detect long-term vegetation changes over time and complement other long-term environmental monitoring data being collected throughout the bay. Submerged aquatic vegetation, especially eelgrass (*Zostera marina*), is critical habitat for many fish species, including Pacific salmon. Eelgrass (*Z. marina*) was observed along nearly the entire shoreline, with a total of 52.1 hectares (129 acres) of seabed surveyed with at least some eelgrass. Subcategories of macroalgae were also found, including big blades (181 acres), fuzzy/bushy (677 acres), and ulvoids (316 acres). Eelgrass results were consistent with the previous 2000 and 2001 DNR ShoreZone survey, which showed a nearly continuous band of eelgrass around the bay. However, eelgrass beds at the southern end of the bay occupy a fairly narrow depth range while those at the north occupy a broader range. Study results suggest that low light availability may be limiting eelgrass growth in the south bay. Since algae blooms can be human-induced factors, such as nutrient loading, it will be important to monitor both nutrients and eelgrass depths as part of the Jimmycometely (JCL) Creek Restoration Program. Macroalgae exhibited even more dramatic difference between the north and south portions of the bay and, as with eelgrass, the study results suggest that lower light availability is the primary cause of these dramatic differences. Further study recommendations include, but are not limited to: continuing eelgrass monitoring, particularly at the south end of the bay; increasing the sampling intensity for macroalgae species in any further vegetation surveys; and removing wood waste from certain areas in the south bay to encourage eelgrass growth near the mouth of the JCL Creek;

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe (FY10) - The Muckleshoot completed an investigation into fine sediment and its effect on salmon spawning habitat in the Middle Green River in King County that included: (1) a detailed evaluation of spawning gravels throughout the Middle Green River, emphasizing sites of previously observed salmonid spawning activity; (2) an evaluation of the current status and future trajectory of sediment delivery from the largest "point source" of sediment within the Middle Green River, the Flaming Geyser landslide; and (3) an evaluation of the study implications on both spawning success and potential management actions in the Green River. Results included that the condition of the substrate of the Middle Green River, in comparison to published standards and to the results of other studies, is not notably impaired along most of this reach of the river. Over three-quarters of the spawning sites evaluated in this study had a sufficiently low level of fine sediment that other factors potentially limiting egg-to-fry survival almost certainly are exerting greater influence on the net success of salmonid populations here. It was determined though that a significant uncertainty is presented by current and future operations at Howard Hanson Dam. The intentions of the US Army Corps of Engineers to reduce the accumulation of fine sediment behind Howard Hanson Dam likely present the single greatest potential for management influence on substrate conditions in the Middle Green River and attention to this (ongoing) management program is likely to have the greatest influence on the future condition of spawning gravels in the river.

Samish Indian Nation (FY10, FY11, and FY12) - The Samish Indian Nation completed two years of key pre-dike removal ecosystem monitoring for Secret Harbor Estuary, located in a WDNR managed Aquatic Reserve and Natural Resource Conservation Area. The comprehensive monitoring program includes: water quality, water temperature, meteorological, vegetation, clam populations, fish populations, avian populations, amphibian population monitoring. WDNR's removal of the dike and construction of the estuary and salt marsh began in September 2013, which temporarily delayed monitoring. The majority of construction was completed by November 2013 and post-restoration monitoring began immediately after. Samish looks forward to continuing this important monitoring work to assess the effects of the 30 acre restoration project that includes the breaching of a tidal dike to restore salt marsh, mud flat and tidally-influenced stream habitat on this largely undeveloped island in the San Juan archipelago of Washington State. The expected benefits of the proposed restoration plan include the restoration of salt marsh habitat of which over 73% has been lost in Puget Sound. Improved hydraulic and hydrologic connectivity to the creek, restored wetland functions, tidal exchange

and saltmarsh habitats will be beneficial by restoring structural habitat complexity thus supporting a greater diversity of species and increasing net productivity.

Snoqualmie Indian Tribe (FY10) - The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe provided funding to their partner, King County, to successfully complete the 100% engineering plans that were essential for the McElhoe-Pearson Levee Setback project, the removal of a levee to restore the Snoqualmie River channel and reconnect a high quality wetland to provide off-channel rearing and flood refuge habitat for juvenile salmon. After the engineered design was completed, the construction of the levee setback was completed with complementary funds in September, 2012. This area now provides approximately two acres of enhanced off-channel rearing and flood refuge habitat for juvenile salmon within the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the Snoqualmie River. Snoqualmie installed time lapse cameras and collected field data at the site, including water quality, channel cross section, vegetation.

Tulalip Tribes (FY11) - The Tulalip Tribes completed a comparative analysis of resource management and restoration policies and authorities of the Tulalip Tribes and adjacent or overlapping jurisdictions. The lands and waters subject to the authorities of the Tulalip Tribes are also be subject to other governmental jurisdictions, which can lead to inter-governmental conflict as well as delay or preclude the approval of permits. This project resulted in a report and information tables that identifies potential areas of conflict and make recommendations for potential resolutions and improving existing decision-making frameworks. Once in place, these improvements should result in fewer conflicts and improved timeliness in the approval and undertaking of development, restoration and protection projects in the Puget Sound areas where the Tulalip Tribes have sole or shared jurisdiction.

(2) REFLECTION: We continue to enjoy and highly value our good working relationship with the EPA and our project officer. Continued and consistent funding for these high priority tribal projects is of the utmost importance to Puget Sound restoration and protection and we look forward to continuing to work with the EPA in current and future fiscal years in supporting our tribes and Puget Sound health.